

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the final office action dated 12/1/2005 Applicants have amended the independent claims with the limitations of previously presented (and entered) dependent claims. The amendments should be entered because the currently amended independent claims have the same limitations as previously presented dependent claims. The currently amended independent claims and the relationship of the currently amended independent claims to the dependent claims of the previously entered amendment of 9/9/2005 is as follows:

Currently amended Independent claim 1 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 3.

Currently amended Independent claim 13 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 17.

Currently amended Independent claim 19 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 20.

Currently amended Independent claim 22 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 24.

Currently amended Independent claim 26 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 27.

Currently amended Independent claim 28 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 29.

Currently amended Independent claim 30 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 32.

Currently amended Independent claim 42 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 46.

Currently amended Independent claim 48 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 49.

No other claim amendments have been made except for cancellations of claims 2, 3, 17, 20, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 46, and 49.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff (US 6,327,628). Applicants traverse the claim rejections and have submitted arguments

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

for the patentability of amended independent claims 1, 13, 19, 22, 26, 28, 30, 42, 48. All other non-canceled claims are dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on the amended independent claims 1, 13, 19, 22, 26, 28, 30, 42, 48 and such non-canceled dependent claims are also patentable over the cited Anuff.

Amended Independent claims 1, 22, 30

Independent claims 1, 22, 30 requires implementing security features at a portal server, comprising:

implementing security features at a portal server, comprising:

receiving a first request from a client;

in response to receiving the first request, authenticating the client;

consulting a database to determine access privileges of the authenticated client for interactions with a plurality of applications, wherein the applications are located at backend servers;

generating code containing selectable interactions with the applications, wherein any authentication for the selectable interactions is performed within the portal server;

sending the code to the client;

responsive to sending the code to the client, receiving a second request from the client, wherein the second request contains a selection of at least one of the selectable interactions;

determining from the selection a set of backend servers to process the second request;

forwarding the second request to the set of backend servers;

receiving results corresponding to the second request from applications executing on the backend servers; and

sending the results to the client, wherein sending the results to the client further comprises:

(i) generating further selectable interactions; and

(ii) sending the further selectable interactions with the results to the client.

Currently amended Independent claim 1 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 3. Currently amended Independent claim 13 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 17. Currently amended Independent claim 19 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 20. Antecedent basis for the term "the

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

request” has been clarified by using the term “the second request”, such that, the term “receiving results corresponding the request” has been rewritten as “receiving results corresponding to the second request”. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 22, 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff. Applicants traverse.

The claims require sending the further selectable interactions with the results to the client, where the results were received by the portal server from an application executing on the backend servers and nowhere does the cited Anuff (col. 3, lines 40-57; FIG 2) teach or disclose these claim requirements. The multiple modules and links discussed in the cited Anuff (col. 3, lines 40-57; FIG 2) have been interpreted by the Examiner has disclosing the claim requirement of further selectable interactions. However, nowhere does the cited Anuff teach or disclose sending the results received by the portal server from an application executing on the backend server to the client with the further selectable interactions.

The claims require the following to be performed by the portal server:

receiving, from the client, a second request that contains a selection of at least one of the selectable interactions;

determining from the selection a set of backend servers to process the second request;

forwarding the second request to the set of backend servers;

receiving results corresponding to the request; and

sending the results to the client, wherein sending the results to the client further comprises:

(i) generating further selectable interactions; and

(ii) sending the further selectable interactions with the results to the client.

Therefore, the portal server is not only sending the further selectable interactions to the client but also sending along with the further selectable interactions the results received from the backend servers by the portal servers, where the results correspond to the second request received from the client.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection the Examiner is requested to indicate where the cited Anuff teaches or discloses the claim requirement that the portal server is not only sending the further selectable interactions to the client but also sending along with the further selectable interactions the results received from the backend servers by the portal servers.

For the above reasons claims 1, 22, 30 are patentable over the cited art.

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037,0017

Independent claims 13, 42

Independent claims 13, and 42 require a backend system for securely making available a backend application, comprising:

- creating data structures corresponding to interactions with the backend application;
- associating privileges for each of the data structures, wherein the privileges are fully checked at a portal application separately hosted from the backend application;
- receiving, at the backend application, a request from the portal application for reading the data structures; and

- sending, from the backend application, the data structures to the portal application, wherein the interactions are operations that can be performed on the backend application and on resources related to the backend application, and wherein the backend application, the operations that can be performed on the backend application, and the resources related to the backend application are displayed on a single Web page on a client.

Currently amended Independent claim 13 has the same limitations as previously entered dependent claim 17. Currently amended Independent claim 42 has the same limitations as previously entered dependent claim 46. The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff. Applicants traverse.

Nowhere does the cited Anuff (col, 3, lines 40-57; FIG. 2) teach or disclose the claim requirement that the operations that can be performed on the backend application are displayed on a single Web page. The modules, links and associated resources as mentioned by the Examiner in Item 35, page 9 of the Office Action do not disclose the claim requirements of the operations that can be performed on the backend application being displayed on a single Web page. Col. 3, lines 40-57 of the cited Anuff discusses that the 'portal comprises an HTML Web page 18 identified as a "front page"', where each page 'presents a predetermined layout of encapsulated modules containing the resources that are available to the user', and allows personalization buttons for revising layout of the portal and the color scheme of the portal. However, nowhere does the cited Anuff (col, 3, lines 40-57; FIG. 2) teach or disclose the claim requirements that the operations that can be performed on the backend application are displayed on the Web page. The operations displayed on the single Web page in the cited Anuff (col. 3, lines 40-57) appear to be hyperlink selections for modifying the portal and does not discuss in

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

col. 3, lines 40-57 of the Examiner cited Anuff that the operations that can be performed on the backend application are displayed on a single Web page.

For the above reasons, claims 13, 26, and 42 are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claims 19, 28, 48

Independent claims 19, 28, 48 require accessing a group of applications at a client computer an comprises:

- authenticating with a portal server;
- receiving a list of applications and interactions that can be performed with the applications from the portal server, wherein the applications are stored at backend servers that are different from the portal server;
- selecting an interaction; and
- receiving results based on the selection of the interaction without authenticating with the backend servers, wherein receiving the results further comprises receiving a set of further interactions selectable by the client computer, wherein the portal server performs all necessary authentications of the client computer, and wherein the backend servers avoid any authentication of the client computer.

Currently amended Independent claim 19 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 20. Currently amended Independent claim 28 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 29. Currently amended Independent claim 48 has the same limitations has previously entered dependent claim 49. The Examiner has rejected claims 19, 28, 48 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff. Applicants traverse.

The claims require that the portal server performs all necessary authentications of the client computer, and wherein the backend servers avoid any authentication of the client computer.

The cited col. 13, lines 32-48, col. 9, line 57 – col. 1, line 24 of the cited Anuff discusses authentications by the portal server. However, the claims have the additional requirements that

- (a) the portal server performs all necessary authentications of the client computer
- (b) the backend servers avoid any authentication of the client computer.

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

The Examiner has used hindsight in concluding that since the cited Anuff discusses authentication by the portal server, the portal server also performs all necessary authentications of the client computer and the backend servers avoid any authentication of the client computer. Nowhere does the cited Anuff preclude additional authentications to be performed by servers other than the portal server. However, the claims require the portal server to perform all necessary authentications of the client computer and the backend servers to avoid any authentication of the client computer.

For the above reasons claim 19, 28, and 48 are patentable over the cited art.

Amended Independent claim 26

Amended independent claim 26 is a system for securely making available a backend application, comprising:

- a backend system hosting the backend application;
- means for creating data structures at the backend system corresponding to interactions with the backend application;
- means for associating privileges for each of the data structures, wherein the privileges are fully checked at a portal application separately hosted from the backend application;
- means for receiving, at the backend application, a request from the portal application for reading the data structures; and
- means for sending, from the backend application, the data structures to the portal application;
- means for receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application;
- means for processing the request without checking for the privileges; and
- means for sending the results of processing the request to the portal application.

Currently amended Independent claim 26 has the same limitations as previously entered dependent claim 27. The Examiner has rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff. Applicants traverse.

Applicants has submitted in the previous amendment dated 9/9/2005 that the cited Anuff did not teach or disclose the claim requirement of receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application. In response to the Applicants arguments in the

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

previous amendment submitted on 9/9/2005 the Examiner has indicated that col. 4, lines 16-32 of the cited Anuff discloses the claim requirement of receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application. Col. 4, line 16-32 of the cited Anuff discusses that the "server can connect to other network resources, for example to acquire information from the Internet or intranet". Additionally, the Examiner has mentioned that that a request "was inherent as it would be required to order to access backend information".

Applicants submit that the claim require receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application whereas the cited Anuff discusses that the portal server can connect to other network resources to acquire information from the Internet. Other network resources of the cited Anuff are different from the backend application of the claim requirements. Additionally, Applicants submit that the request is not inherent because it should be possible for backend applications to directly update the portal application in certain systems without a request a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application.

For the above reasons claim 26 is patentable over the cited art.

Arguments previously presented by the Applicants:

The Examiner has indicated that col. 13, lines 60 of the cited Anuff discloses the claim requirement of receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application. Col. 13, line 60 of the cited Anuff discusses a user clicking the module's edit button and does not teach or disclose the claim requirement of receiving a request for an interaction with the backend application from the portal application.

The Examiner has indicated that col. 13, lines 53-55 and col. 13, lines 61-63 disclose the claim requirement of processing the request without checking for the privileges. Col. 13, lines 53-55 of the cited Anuff discusses that once a user has been registered, that user's front page is displayed via the browser application. Col. 13, lines 61-63 discusses that when the user clicks the module's edit button the module displays news categories etc. Nowhere does the cited col. 13, lines 53-55 or the cited col. 13, lines 53-55 of the cited Anuff teach or disclose the claim requirement of processing the request without checking for the privileges.

The Examiner has indicated that col. 14, lines 3-9 of the cited Anuff discloses the claim requirement of sending the results of processing the request to the portal application. Col. 14, lines 3-9 of the cited Anuff discusses sending from the portal server a display for the client.

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of 12/1/2005

Serial No. 10/090,556
Docket No. SJO920010066US1
Firm No. 0037.0017

Nowhere does col. 14, lines 3-9 of the cited Anuff disclose the claim requirement of sending the results of processing the request to the portal application.

For the above reasons claims 26 is patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 4-12, 14-16, 18, 21, 25-26, 33-41, 43-45, 47, 50

The Examiner has also rejected dependent pending claims 4-12, 14-16, 18, 21, 25-26, 33-41, 43-45, 47, 50 which are patentable over the cited art because they depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 13, 19, 22, 26, 28, 30, 42, 48 which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending independent claims 1, 13, 19, 22, 28, 30, 42, 48, and pending dependent claims 4-12, 14-16, 18, 21, 25-26, 33-41, 43-45, 47, 50 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney/agent invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 557-2292 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: February 1, 2006

By: 

Rabindranath Dutta
Registration No. 51,010

Please direct all correspondences to:

Rabindranath Dutta
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984